

DANIEL G. BOGDEN  
United States Attorney

PATRICK A. ROSE  
Assistant United States Attorney

BENJAMIN C. MIZER  
Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General  
U.S. Department of Justice, Civil Division

WILLIAM C. PEACHEY  
Director, District Court Section  
Office of Immigration Litigation

SARAH S. WILSON  
Senior Litigation Counsel

SAIRAH G. SAEED  
Trial Attorney  
P.O. Box 868, Ben Franklin Station  
Washington, DC 20044  
Telephone: (202) 532-4067  
Facsimile: (202) 305-7000  
Email: sairah.g.saeed@usdoj.gov

Attorneys for Defendants

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**

**DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

TOCARA INVESTMENTS, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	Case No. 2:15-cv-00787-JAD-PAL
Plaintiffs,	)	
	)	
v.	)	
	)	
JEH JOHHSON, Secretary, Department of	)	
Homeland Security, <i>et al.</i> ,	)	
	)	
Defendants.	)	

**STIPULATED REQUEST FOR BRIEFING SCHEDULE**

Pursuant to LR 16-1(c)(1), Defendants requests that the Court issue a briefing schedule substantially similar to the following:

1. Motions to amend the pleadings or to add parties shall be filed and served no later than: June 24, 2016.

2. Defendants will file and serve the Certified Administrative Record (“CAR”) by July 25, 2016.
3. Plaintiffs’ Motion for Summary Judgment (“MSJ”) and Statement of Material Facts (“SMF”) shall be filed and served no later than: August 23, 2016.
4. Defendants’ Opposition to Plaintiffs’ MSJ and Defendants’ Cross-MSJ and SMF shall be filed and served no later than: October 24, 2016.
5. Plaintiffs’ Opposition to Defendants’ Cross-MSJ and Reply in Support of Plaintiffs’ MSJ shall be filed and served no later than: November 7, 2016.
6. Defendants reserve the right to seek this Court’s leave to Reply in support of their Cross-MSJ and the Reply shall be filed and served no later than November 14, 2016.
7. Should Plaintiffs seek a Sur-reply, they may do so only upon motion to this Court and the Sur-reply shall be filed and served no later than November 21, 2016.

The parties have conferred and have agreed to the proposed schedule.

The general rule is that courts are limited to the administrative record when reviewing a final agency action because “the focal point for judicial review should be the administrative record already in existence, not some new record made initially in the reviewing court.” *Camp v. Pitts*, 411 U.S. 138, 142 (1973). “There is a strong presumption against discovery into administrative proceedings[.]” *NVE, Inc. v. Dep’t of Health & Human Servs.*, 436 F.3d 182, 195 (3d Cir. 2006). The administrative record “consists of all documents and materials directly or *indirectly* considered by agency decision-makers and includes evidence contrary to the agency’s positions.” *Thompson v. U.S. Dep’t of Labor*, 885 F.2d 551, 555 (9th Cir. 1989) (emphasis in original). Importantly, “[e]vidence cannot be submitted in the reviewing court and the parties are bound by the evidence in the administrative record.” *Redmond v. United States*, 507 F.2d 1007 (5th Cir. 1975). Exceptions to this rule include a necessity to go outside of the administrative record to explain the agency’s actions, “to determin[e] whether the agency has considered all relevant factors or has explained its course of conduct or grounds of decision” or “when it appears the agency has relied on documents or materials not included in the record.” *Animal Def. Council v. Hodel*, 840 F.2d 1432, 1436 (9th Cir. 1988) (internal quotations and citations omitted). Here, it is clear from the

record that the agency has considered all the relevant issues and has explained the basis for its decision; the agency has not relied on any factors outside of the administrative record. Accordingly, both parties have agreed to no discovery outside of the administrative record.

An action for review of an administrative record generally proceeds according to a briefing schedule. *See* LR 16-1(c)(1); *see also* Fed. R. Civ. P. 26(a)(1)(B)(i), 26(f)(1). Accordingly, Defendants request that the Court issue a briefing schedule substantially similar in form as that proposed above.

DATED: April 28, 2016

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Eva Garcia-Mendoza, Esq.  
EVA GARCIA-MENDOZA, ESQ.  
Garcia-Mendoza & Snavely  
Nevada Bar No.: 1779  
501 So. Seventh Street  
Las Vegas, NV 89101  
Telephone: (702) 384-8484  
Facsimile: (702) 384-0207  
Email: [Evagm@gms4law.com](mailto:Evagm@gms4law.com)

ATTORNEYS FOR PLAINTIFFS

BENJAMIN C. MIZER  
Principal Deputy Assistant Attorney General

WILLIAM C. PEACHEY  
Director

SARAH S. WILSON  
Senior Litigation Counsel

SAIRAH G. SAEED  
s/Sairah G. Saeed  
Trial Attorney  
Office of Immigration Litigation  
District Court Section  
Civil Division, U.S. Department of Justice  
P.O. Box 868, Ben Franklin Station  
Washington, DC 20044  
Telephone: (202) 532-4067  
Facsimile: (202) 305-7000  
Email: [sairah.g.saeed@usdoj.gov](mailto:sairah.g.saeed@usdoj.gov)

ATTORNEYS FOR DEFENDANTS

**IT IS SO ORDERED:**

  
**UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE**  
**Dated: May 16, 2016**

**CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

I certify that on April 28, 2016, I served a copy of the foregoing Stipulated Request for Briefing Schedule on the attorneys of record by filing this document with the Clerk of the Court through the CM/ECF system, which will provide electronic notice and an electronic link to this document to all attorneys of record.

s/Sairah G. Saeed  
SAIRAH G. SAEED  
Trial Attorney  
United States Department of Justice